



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/003,325 | 01/06/1998 | JEFFREY L. PARKER | D-6524A | 8860 |

7590 10/01/2002

ARTHUR G YEAGER
112 W ADAMS ST
SUITE 1305
JACKSONVILLE, FL 322023853

EXAMINER

WILSON, JACQUELINE B

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2612

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/003,325

Applicant(s)
Parker et al.

Examiner
Jacqueline Wilson

Art Unit
2612



— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 22, 2002
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 109-164 and 166 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 109-164 and 166 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2612

DETAILED ACTION VII

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 07/22/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to Claims 109, 126, 163, and 166, the newly added limitations are analyzed and discussed below. Please see discussion below.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, with respect to Claims 110-125, 127-137, 141-162, and 164, the applicant argues that the prior art (Parker'296) does not teach or suggest the use of two or more cameras operated by commands from at least two movable control devices used by at least two users, and that it would not have been obvious to combine Parker'296 with Uehara'543. Parker'296 was not used to teach this limitation. Uehara'543 teaches the use of two or more cameras operated from at least two movable control devices by at least two users. Parker'296 is used to teach the operation of a control device (remote unit 18) which is capable of operating a camera in which the control

Art Unit: 2612

devices remembers the field of view position of the camera and remembering the control device that issued the respective command (col. 2, lines 1-10). Therefore, the rejections are maintained.

With respect to Claims 138-140, the applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach the control of audio signals from the control devices being used. The examiner disagrees.

Uehara'543 specifically teaches that the control devices control a sound control circuit for operating audio signal (col. 2, lines 24-32). Therefore, the rejections are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 138-140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 138 recites the limitation "the at least two devices". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

Art Unit: 2612

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 109, 126, 163, and 166 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Uehara (US 5,917,543).

Regarding Claim 109, Uehara '543 teaches two cameras (fig. 2, 10A and 10B; also 10A/10B and 12A/12B; camera 10A and 12A are in a single area). The operator at the local station is able to control the camera 10A at their station as well as the camera 10B in the remote station, and the operator at the local station is able to control cameras 10B and 12B of the remote station and vice versa. Uehara '543 further teaches a single automatic control system (11A, 32A, and 30A generates a control system) for controlling the field of view of the cameras (such as pan, tilt, zoom, and focus), at least two control devices (34A and 34B; see also fig. 4) being moveable respectively by at least two user (person a and b), associating each of at least two control devices with respective of at least two users at respective locations selected by the respective at least two users (conference room A and B), associating at least one field of view of one camera with a respective control device at a location selected by a respective one of at least two users (col. 5, lines 17+), remembering a field of view of the camera (referred to as normal state, see fig. 3), issuing a command from one control device (34B) of the at least two control devices to the automatic control system (col. 5, lines 5+ teaches that when person a stops operating a button on the control device 34A, the command is sent to the automatic control system to maneuver the camera 10B, and vice versa), identifying by the automatic control system the control device that

Art Unit: 2612

issued the command (this feature is inherent since when person **a** operates the operating device which sends information to the automatic control system, the camera associated with person **b** is complying), automatically moving by automatic control system the field of view of the camera to the field of view remembered and associated with the control device identified (col. 6, lines 6+). Uehara '543 teaches that the control device in conference room A operates the camera of conference room B, and vice versa. When user "a" presses a return button (142) of the control device, the system controller remembers the previously set values from the memory (not shown), and returns the camera according to the control device that is performing remote operations (col. 10, lines 16+; see also fig. 8). Uehara '543 teaches a memory is present for storing information regarding the values for corresponding video conferencing sites (see col. 7, lines 8-15) such as values between conference room A and conference room B, conference room A and conference room C, etc. The control device (fig. 4) indicates several letters in which the control device identifies which conference room to operate. Since Uehara '543 taught a user at conference room A is able to operate a remote location as well as itself in the prior art teaching (see col. 2, lines 25+), it is inherent that the invention is able to perform the same function. For example, if user "a" depresses A on their control device, then user "a" will have control of its camera in a similar manner as discussed above. This teaching is synonymous to the limitation of issuing a command from another of the at least two control devices, and identifying the control device that issued the command. When the user "a" presses an amount-of-return setting button (142), the field of view of the camera automatically moves to the position remembered (col. 10, lines 16+; see also fig. 8).

Art Unit: 2612

The limitation of remembering the control device that issued the respective command in steps D and G after respective command has been issued is inherent in Uehara '543. Once the control device indicates which camera to operate, the system remembers and only allows that controller to maneuver the camera.

Furthermore, Uehara'543 teaches that the automatic control system waits for the user to confirm the state of the displayed image on its monitor (col. 11, lines 15+) This reads on the limitation of the automatic control system remembering the control device that issued the respective command after the respective command has been implemented by the automatic control system since the automatic control system knows which control device is issuing the command for further action.

In regards to **claims 126 and 163**, see discussion in claims 109.

In regards to **claim 166**, see the discussion in claim 109.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2612

7. Claims 110-125, 127-137, 141-162, and 164 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara (US 5,917,543) and Parker et al. (U.S. 5,471,296).

In regards to **claim 110**, Uehara '543 fails to specifically disclose issuing commands from each of the control devices to remember a field of view position of the camera and remembering the control device that issued the respective command. However, Parker teaches an automatic control system (col. 4, lines 23-30) for controlling the field of view of the camera and a control device (18) which is movable independently of the automatic control system and the camera by a user to a selected location that controls the tracking, pan, tilt, etc. (See fig. 14; col. 4, lines 62-col. 5). Parker et al. '296 also discloses remembering the field of views in the remote controller (col. 2, lines 1-10). It would have been obvious to combine Parker et al. '296 in the device of Uehara '543 to improve the functions of the remote controllers, by individually controlling the camera to a predetermined position. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the each of the control devices to remember the field of view and automatically tracking of at least one remote controlling device.

In regards to **claim 111**, see discussion in claim 110. As disclosed in claim 1, the camera can be moved to the different field of view remembered by the remote controller issuing command was discussed above.

In regards to **claim 112**, see discussion in claim 110. Further, obviously when positions of the camera are remembered, it is with respect to a known reference.

Art Unit: 2612

In regards to **claim 113**, see discussion in claim 110. Further, as can be seen in controlling the position of camera (Figure 9), both planes can be controlled. Obviously when the position of camera is remembered it is in both directions by Pan and tilt.

In regards to **claim 114**, see discussion in claim 113.

In regards to **claim 115**, see discussion in claims 110 and 113.

In regards to **claim 116**, Uehara '543 shows remembering the position of the camera in two planes of different positions, and changing positions as controlled, by changing pan, tilt, zoom and focus as discussed above. However, Uehara '543 does not show remembering iris position and iris being controlled. Remembering iris settings and controlling the iris from the remote controller is well known in the art as shown by Parker et al. '296 (col. 9, lines 47+), where the iris along with zoom, focus, pan and tilt are controlled. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to also include the control of iris along with pan, tilt, zoom and focus and also remembering the iris value for different positions as shown by Parker et al. '296, in the remote control device of the video conferencing of Uehara '543, to provide iris control of the camera so that the image to be displayed will be improved.

In regards to **claim 117**, see discussion in claims 110 and 113.

In regards to **claim 118**, see discussion in claims 110 and 113. The operator may change the pan or tilt while maintaining the same zoom perspective.

In regards to **claim 119**, see the discussion in claim 116.

In regards to **claim 120**, see the discussion in claim 116.

Art Unit: 2612

Regarding **claim 121**, although not specifically stated, it would have been obvious that in video conferencing system, when another remote user decides to control a local camera, all commands from the previous remote user are overridden so that the present controller may have complete access to the camera functions. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to issue a command to override subsequent commands from other control devices affecting control of the field of view of the camera.

In regards to **claim 122**, see discussion in claim 111.

In regards to **claim 123**, see discussion in claim 110.

In regards to **claim 124**, see discussion in claim 110. Further, selecting one of the previously stored settings would allow any control device to recall a specific field.

In regards to **claim 125**, see discussion in claim 110. Further, issuing command from a remote controller consistently by giving a new command will provide automatic tracking of the remote control device.

In regards to **claim 127**, see discussion in claim 126.

In regards to **claim 128**, see discussion in claim 126.

In regards to **claim 129**, see discussion in claim 117.

Art Unit: 2612

In regards to **claim 130**, see discussion in claim 126. Although not specifically stated, it is notoriously well known in the video conferencing art to enable a user to choose a specific video output signal from a camera to be displayed. (Official Notice)

In regards to **claim 131**, see discussion in claim 126 and 130.

In regards to **claim 132**, see discussion in claim 126.

In regards to **claim 133**, see discussion in claim 126.

In regards to **claim 134**, Uehara '543 discloses a control device for regulating the transmission of video and audio signal (28A and 28B) of a conference (see fig. 3). It would be obvious to treat the audio signal in the same manner as the operator selects to transmit and present the corresponding video signal. See also the discussion in claim 126.

In regards to **claim 135**, see discussion in claim 134.

In regards to **claim 136**, see discussion in claim 134.

In regards to **claim 137**, see discussion in claim 134.

In regards to **claim 141**, see the discussion in claim 126.

In regards to **claim 142**, see discussion in claim 110. Further, by the operator continuously selecting pan or tilt would allow for automatic tracking as the command is being continuously executed.

In regards to **claim 143**, see discussion in claims 110. Cessation of command is equivalent to overriding of command.

In regards to **claim 144**, see the discussion in claim 130.

Art Unit: 2612

In regards to **claim 145**, see the discussion in claim 131.

In regards to **claim 146**, see the discussion in claim 124.

In regards to **claim 147**, see the discussion in claim 125.

In regards to **claim 148**, see the discussion in claim 121.

In regards to **claim 149**, see the discussion in claim 110 and 121. The operator may select not to override subsequent future commands which allows the other control device to resume issuing commands.

In regards to **claim 150**, see the discussion in claim 110.

In regards to **claim 151**, see the discussion in claim 110.

In regards to **claim 152**, see the discussion in claim 110.

In regards to **claim 153**, see the discussion in claim 84.

In regards to **claim 154**, as discussed in claim 110, Uehara '543 discloses plural control devices. Each control device allows the operator to command the cameras to pan, tilt, zoom , and provide automatic tracking of the control device. If the conference center comprised plural operators it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to not only provide automatic tracking of the commanding control device but, also provide the option of automatic tracking of the other control device. Offering the operator the user-friendliness of automatic tracking of either the control device or another control device would have provided a great additional benefit.

In regards to **claim 155**, see the discussion in claims 143 and 154.

Art Unit: 2612

In regards to **claim 156**, see the discussion in claim 134.

In regards to **claim 157**, see the discussion in claim 135.

In regards to **claim 158**, see the discussion in claim 136

In regards to **claim 159**, see the discussion in claim 142.

In regards to **claim 160**, see the discussion in claim 138.

In regards to **claim 161**, see the discussion in claim 135.

In regards to **claim 162**, see the discussion in claim 137.

In regards to **claim 163**, see the discussion in claim 110.

In regards to **claim 164**, see the discussion in claim 110.

8. Claims 138-140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara '543 and Parker et al. '296, and in further view of Sano et al.

In regards to **claim 138**, Uehara '543 discloses the video conference center for selectively transmitting several camera fields and associated audio. However, Uehara '543 does not explicitly disclose the use of a plurality of conference sites. Sano does disclose the use of three or more conference sites (Abstract). Allowing more participants to video conference at one time would have been a desirable feature of the video conference. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide multiple conference sites and control devices for the video conference. See also the discussion in claims 110 and 135.

Art Unit: 2612

In regards to **claim 139**, see the discussion in claim 138.

In regards to **claim 140**, see the discussion in claim 138.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiries concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to **Jacqueline Wilson** whose telephone number is (703) 308-5080. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday (alternate Fridays off) from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

Art Unit: 2612

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wendy Garber**, can be reached at (703) 305-4929. The fax number for this group is (703) 872-9314.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231


or Faxed to:

(703) 872-9314, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, V.A., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

JBW

September 11, 2002


WENDY R. GARBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600